



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his *Sister Gwendydd*, Gwendydd addresses Myrddin in flattering terms as her brother, and proceeds to examine him minutely in the history of North Wales.

None of these Welsh poems may with any assurance be said to antedate the *Vita Merlini*, and Lot has called attention to the fact that the influence of the *Vita Merlini* may be recognized in them. "Est-ce à dire que tout dans ces poèmes dérive de Gaufré de Monmouth? Nous ne le pensons pas. Nous croyons au contraire que celui-ci a utilisé d'antiques traditions galloises, écrites ou orales, mais elles ne nous sont pas directement parvenues."⁴¹ The suggestions that I have offered above in regard to Ganiada are altogether in harmony with such a view as this. Although with our present scanty knowledge of the true relation between the historic bard Myrddin and the Merlin of Geoffrey of Monmouth, we are treading here on debatable land, it is not unreasonable to suppose that in so far as the Welsh sources represent Gwendydd, wife of Rydderch, king of the Cambrians, as Myrddin's sister, they are using tradition which was started by Geoffrey's pen,⁴² but that the maiden of the apple-tree doubtless belongs to the same early tradition which we have seen Geoffrey may have altered at his own discretion.

Whether Geoffrey found his story in a *bon lai Breton de Merlin*, such as we hear of in *Renart le Nouvel*,⁴³ we do not know; but of the contents of his original we may form a fairly clear idea. It doubtless told of Merlin's stay with an other-world maiden in a beautiful dwelling that she had herself built for him, of her anger against him because he had deserted her, forgotten her command, or disobeyed her will, of his frenzy at the knowledge that he was under the ban of her displeasure, and, probably, of his restoration by fairy agency to reason and to his loved-one's presence. Every striking alteration that Geoffrey makes in this material may be accounted for by the rationalizing tendency, by the introduction of popular story, by a moulding of the theme to fit the general structure of the poem, by his customary methods and personal aim. The early fairy-mistress story dies out of the extant Merlin ma-

terial, and is succeeded by that of Niniane. Ganiada had been made Merlin's sister by Geoffrey's hand, and thus spoiled for romantic purposes. Under these conditions another fairy-mistress story, belonging to a popular type and developed along different lines, quite naturally took the place of that which Geoffrey had succeeded admirably in distorting.

LUCY ALLEN PATON.

Cambridge, Mass.

PINDAR AND GOETHE.

Although it is almost universally admitted that the influence of Pindar may be traced in Goethe's early lyrics, there is much dispute as to the actual extent of this influence. W. Scherer¹ in referring to Goethe's odes of the years 1772-74 characterizes them as "gräzisierungende Oden" and speaks of "gewaltsam schwungvoller Vortrag Pindarischer Gesänge." Loeper² finds the Pindaric influence manifested in *Wanderers Sturmlied* and in *Adler und Taube*. Düntzer admits³ it only in *Wanderers Sturmlied*. A. Michaelis⁴ believes that the poetical form of *Wanderers Sturmlied*, *Prometheus*, *Harzreise*, and *Ganymed* was derived from Pindar. The conclusions of Minor and Sauer,⁵ who have given the most exhaustive discussion of the subject, may be summed up in the following four statements: 1, Goethe took Pindar, as he understood him, for his model in his odes *Wanderers Sturmlied* and *Adler und Taube*; 2, The diction of these odes is derived in part from Pindar; 3, Goethe borrowed from Pindar the run-on-line (enjambement) at the end of a stanza; 4, Pindar and Herder were the first to give him a clear conception of the importance of technical mastery of language for poetic purposes. We shall have occasion often to return to this treatise; it is again and again referred to as authoritative on the question at issue and on Goethe's early relations to Herder (cf. Weissenfels, *Goethe in St. u. Dr.*, 1894, p. 140, foot-note; R.

¹ *Geschichte der deutsch. Lit.*, 5. ed., 1885, p. 488.

² *Goethe's Gedichte*, 2d. part, 1883, pp. 320-21, 325.

³ *Erläuterungen z. d. deutsch. Klassikern*, vol. 70-72, 1876, p. 321 ff.

⁴ "Goethe u. d. Antike" in *Strassb. Goethevorträge*, 1899, p. 121.

⁵ *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie*, 1880, pp. 42, 82-84, 99 ff., 102.

⁴¹ *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 520.

⁴² Cf. *Ib.*, 520, 521, 533.

⁴³ See *Roman de Renart*, ed. Méon, Paris, 1826, II, vv. 2149, 2150.

Meyer's Goethe biography, 2d. ed., p. 721) and may therefore be considered as practically new in spite of its having been published more than twenty years ago.

As is apparent from the foregoing the commentators are agreed only on one point, namely that the ode *Wanderers Sturmlied* was effected by Pindar; they disagree as to the particular manner. There can be no doubt that it is extremely difficult to disentangle the genuine Pindaric elements in this ode. Loeper finds only two correspondences with Pindar: 1, in ll. 71-75 (praise of "Jupiter Pluvius"); 2, in ll. 101 ff. (allusion to the Greek games and to Pindar); on the other hand he points out that ll. 1, 18 ff., 97, 102 are suggestive of Horace. Even if we consider that Pindar is twice mentioned (ll. 56, 109), the similarities between *Wanderers Sturmlied* and the odes of Pindar are slight, and numerically there are fewer adaptations from Pindar than from Horace. Further considerations will tend to weaken their significance. Goethe may have borrowed the idea of "Jupiter Pluvius" and the corresponding one of the "sturmthmende Gottheit" (l. 91) from Homer and Klopstock as well as from Pindar. In Pindar Zeus is in the first place the hurler of lightnings and the thunderer, while the view that he is the God of the storm and rain is only of secondary importance. In Klopstock on the other hand the idea of the presence of God in the storm is essential;⁶ besides the pantheism implied in "Der du mich fassend deckst, Jupiter Pluvius" (l. 82-83) is more characteristic of Klopstock than of Pindar.

The only possible relation between *Wanderers Sturmlied* and the odes of Pindar must therefore be sought for in its general thought and in its form. As to the form Goethe might have found a suggestion in Pindar as he was conceived by the conventional literary criticism of the day; this ideal of Pindar appears, for instance, in Klopstock's ode *An meine Freunde*, ll. 5-8:

"Willst du zu Strophen werden, o Lied? oder
Ununterwürfig, Pindars Gesängen gleich,
Gleich Zeus erhabenem trunknem Sohne,
Frey aus der schaffenden Sel enttaumeln."

⁶See below.

⁷This idea is entirely compatible with the theism of Klopstock.

This imitation of a fictitious Pindar may have occurred; but even then Pindar would have been to Goethe only the exponent of poetical ideals with which Goethe was already imbued from other sources. At any rate the real, historic Pindar cannot have been the model for *Wanderers Sturmlied*. This is born out by the following points.

A characteristic feature of the poem is the fact that a number of lines begin with the same word (cf. ll. 5-6, 16-17, 19-21, 26-27, 34-36, 46-48, 72-74, etc.). Pindar has no such repetitions, whereas they are common in the Anacreontic school, especially Gleim, and in Goethe's own earlier poems.—Note further the use of the apostrophe to "Genius" and to "Jupiter Pluvius" which runs through the poem. A direct apostrophe to Zeus is seldom found in Pindar; the Olympian and Pythean odes contain only four cases (4., 5., 13. Ol., 1. Pyth. odes), and even then the apostrophe consists only of a short prayer for some divine favor. Pindar addresses his odes to princes, prominent citizens and especially to the victors whom he praises. One might of course assert that Goethe may have developed his use of apostrophe from the one found in Pindar; but this would be a rather far-fetched explanation. On the other hand, apostrophe to God and the Redeemer is very frequent in Klopstock.—More striking results are furnished by the study of the sentence-structure in the ode. The style shows a remarkable syntactical monotony, since independent clauses in the present indicative or imperative prevail. Sometimes the sentences fairly shrink to a telegram style. This enables the poet by joining together an indefinite number of chiefly co-ordinate clauses to form agglomerations of sentences of almost any length; and there is no inner reason why their close should, as is the case, coincide with the end of a stanza. It is apparent that this structure of sentences is the very opposite of the one found in Pindar, while it is exactly that for which Klopstock shows a strong predilection.

One could try to meet all these objections to an assumed influence of Pindar on Goethe by the remark: *Wanderers Sturmlied* may not show Pindaric form, but it certainly represents Pindar's ideas. This, however, is still less the case. As a rule Pindar's odes present the same sequence of thought touching chiefly upon these three points:

1. mention and praise of the person to whom the ode is dedicated; 2. eulogy of his family, if it has already gained some fame; 3. mythological allusions and references to contemporary events.⁸ Of this only mythological allusions are found in *Wanderers Sturmlied*. Pindar's narrative is objective. *Wanderers Sturmlied*, on the other hand, is intensely subjective; it is the expression of Goethe's sublime egotism. To explain this chief characteristic of the ode we have to go back either to Herder or to Klopstock, or else we must derive it from Goethe's own nature; egotism is foreign to Pindar.

There are other things in the ode which remind us not unfrequently of Klopstock. I would connect l. 1 with Klopstock's *Lehrling der Griechen*, l. 1, rather than with Horace, *Carm.* iv, 3, l. 1; Klopstock uses the word "Genius" while Horace uses "Melpomene." "Der du mich fassend deckst, Jupiter Pluvius" (l. 82-83) reminds one of "Allgegenwärtig, Vater, schliessest du mich ein" (*Dem Allgegenwärtigen*, l. 21-22); it must be noted that in this same poem of Klopstock the idea of the presence of God in the storm is found (ll. 39-40). Loeper remarks⁹ on this passage: "Im Preise des Wettergotts, der sturmathmenden Gottheit, des Jupiter Pluvius, wetteifert Goethe hier mit Pindar." But this praise of Zeus is for Pindar rather incidental. Moreover, it must be noted that for him Zeus is in the first place the hurler of lightnings and the thunderer (9. Ol. 6; 11. Ol. 83-84). On the other hand, the idea that God is present in the roaring storm is fundamental in Klopstock (*Dem Allgegenwärtigen*, ll. 37-44, 69-72. *Der Abschied*, ll. 5-9. *Frühlingsfeier*, ll. 57-60, 105 ff.). "Dich strömt mein Lied" (l. 76) finds a parallel in "So strömt der Gesang, Thuiskon, deines Geschlechts" (*Aganippe und Phiala*, l. 9-10); "strömen" is very frequent in Klopstock. *Schauer Mitternacht, schweben, Seligkeit, quellen, sterblich* may be considered as especially characteristic of Klopstock. The expression "Ceder" is not found in Pindar; Klopstock uses the word in *Dem Allmächtigen*, l. 72; *Die Glückseligkeit aller*, l. 8, and in *Messias*.

The word and idea of "Genius" certainly is not

derived from Pindar. Although "Genius" here may be interpreted as meaning a phase of Goethe's own personality, his poetical faculty, yet Goethe addresses it as a guiding spirit. Do we not find a parallel to the first stanzas of *Wanderers Sturmlied* in the first stanzas of Klopstock's *Stunden der Weihe*? In the latter Klopstock appeals to the quiet hours of evening not to depart without their blessing; he has the vision of one of the heavenly host saying:

"Eilt, heilige Stunden, die ihr die Unterwelt
Aus diesen hohen Pforten Gottes
Selten besuchet, zu jenem Jüngling,
Der Gott, den Mittler, Adams Geschlecht singt!
Deckt ihn mit dieser schattigen kühlen Nacht
Der goldnen Flügel, dass er einsam
Unter dem himmlischen Schatten dichte."

This order is obeyed. The situation in the ode is: Klopstock feels himself under the protection of the twilight hours; he believes theirs to be the credit of his odes (ll. 13-16). Compare this with the beginning of *Wanderers Sturmlied*, where the "Genius" takes the place of the hours in *Stunden d. W.* The parallel becomes still more evident if we consider ll. 71-75, in which Goethe expresses the belief of being Jupiter's *Sänger*, and remember that Klopstock's *Stunden d. W.* bore in the Darmstadt edition of 1771 the heading: "Als der Dichter den Messias zu singen unternahm," and also that Goethe is supposed to have written the ode while returning from his stay among the admirers of Klopstock at Darmstadt.

Pindar had no important nor even considerable influence on *Wanderers Sturmlied*. We have in this ode a poem in which reminiscences of Goethe's reading in the classics and in Klopstock are combined with genuine Storm and Stress impulses to unique effect.

Many of the foregoing remarks hold good also for the poem *Adler und Taube*. Minor and Sauer maintain¹⁰ that it is half Pindaric half Anacreontic. They refer to the eagle of *Adler und Taube* as the representative of loftiness and strength of character and the bird of Zeus, as which he frequently occurs in Pindar. But the eagle has always been the symbol of such qualities. The contrasting of eagle and dove is absent in Pindar, who sets against each other eagle and

⁸ Now and then reflections of a general nature are inserted.

⁹ *Goethes Ged.*, etc., p. 320.

¹⁰ *Studien*, etc., 50.

raven (2. Ol., 96), and eagle and crow (3. Nem., 76 ff.); it is, however, found in the Anacreontic school and in Horace, *Carm.* iv, 4 (ll. 31-32). Repetitions of the same word at the beginning of successive lines are less numerous, but not entirely wanting (cf. ll. 20-21, 37-39, 48-49). The style is fluent; the diction reminds one of the Anacreontics and of Klopstock (*Jüngling, wandeln, allgegenwärtig, tieftrauernd, tiefernst*, etc.). The leading thought, namely, the idea that the genius needs another sphere of life and activity than the *Philister*, is certainly not traceable to Pindar. Pindar is so absolutely the man of a sound, cheerful, sober philosophy of life that he ranks much more with the Anacreontics than with Storm and Stress. He recommends serenity and contentment with a humble lot; he praises the life of the middle classes compared with that of the tyrants. He admonishes the unfortunate ones to bear their sorrows with equanimity; in no case whatsoever is man to give up all hope. Melancholy resignation is foreign to Pindar. Cf. 2. Pyth., 93:¹¹ "It avails to bear lightly the yoke placed on our necks." 3. Pyth., 107: "Moderate in moderate fortune, great in great will I be; the bliss that befalls me I will cherish in mind, improving it to my best." 11. Pyth. 52: "For since in the commonweal I find the middle state bloom with bliss the most lasting, I despise the lot of sovereigns." 3. Pyth. 81:¹² "For one good the immortals give to men two evils: but these fools have not power to bear in moderation; not so the wise, who turn to view the good in all things." Pindar's principles apparently correspond much more with those of the dove than with those of the eagle. Furthermore the downfall of the eagle in the poem is described with more length and detail than required by the symbolic character of the fable; Goethe admires in the wounded hero the tragical beauty of fallen greatness. This idea would never have appealed to Pindar; his object always is living vigor and courage.

Of less importance to the question at issue is

the run-on-line touched upon by Minor and Sauer. They maintain,¹³ as above stated, that Goethe took over from Pindar the *enjambement* at the end of a stanza, but that he did not imitate Pindar's use of dividing a word between the end of one line and the beginning of the next, although this is, as they assert, common in Pindar. Neither of the two statements seems to be quite correct. If we distinguish between strophic, linear (Zeilen-) and verbal (Wort-) *enjambement*, then matters are very clear regarding the first two cases. Goethe makes no use of strophic *enjambement*, while he frequently uses linear *enjambement*. He does not use the first, although it is not unfrequently found in Pindar; on the other hand he did not need any model for the latter, since linear *enjambement* is found in his poems of the Leipzig and Strassburg periods.

It is not quite correct to say that verbal *enjambement* is common in Pindar. The metrical unit in his odes within the stanza is the *πούς* (*peplos*). If each *πούς* is printed as a separate line, then we have in Pindar not unfrequent verbal *enjambements*; on the other hand if one prints the *πόδες* which belong together as one line, then Pindar's odes never show verbal *enjambement*. The latter practice is almost generally adopted in the editions published in the latter half of the nineteenth century, while the editions used by Goethe contained, as it seems, short lines with frequent verbal *enjambement*. Goethe, however, did not follow Pindar in this respect.

Little need be said concerning another statement made by Minor und Sauer. If Herder and Pindar really were the men who convinced Goethe of the importance of linguistic perfection for poetry, then they could at best boast of having revived in the poet's mind a principle which he had temporarily lost sight of. For an exaggerated appreciation of the formal element in poetry as regards both style and metre was one of the chief characteristics of the Anacreontic school, whose disciple Goethe still was in his early Strassburg days. It is true, Goethe writes to Herder in July, 1772: "Ueber den Worten Pindar's *ἐπικρατεῖν δύνασθαι* ist mir's aufgegangen." But one must remember that Goethe refers here chiefly to the "Grund meines spechtigen Wesens;" besides, the

¹¹ Transl. from *The odes of Pindar in English Prose*, Oxford, 1824.

¹² The number of sentences in Pindar which are opposed to Storm and Stress view could easily be multiplied. Pindar conceives especially no titanic defiance of the gods (cf. 5. Isthm. 14; 6. Isthm. 43 ff.).

¹³ *Studien*, etc., 102.

letter gives the impression of having been written by a pupil who wants to please his teacher.

The prime agent of Goethe's lyrical development between the Strassburg and Wetzlar periods were not the classics; it was probably Klopstock. His influence upon *Elysium*, *Felsweihesang* and *Pilgers Morgenlied* is universally recognized. He is, as has been seen above, in part responsible for *Wanderers Sturmlied*. His influence is perhaps traceable also in Goethe's *Seefahrt*, the poem being the positive counterpart of Klopstock's *Die Wellen*, ll. 21—end. Only Goethe's later didactic odes, *Das Göttliche* and *Grenzen der Menschheit* show real parallels to Pindar; cf. *Grenzen d. M.*, ll. 1-6 with Pindar's view of Zeus as the hurler of lightnings, and *ibid.* ll. 11-13 with 6. Isthm. 43 ff. *Harzreise* ll. 6-18 remind us of Pindar's fatalism. But it is hard to say whether we have here real Pindaric reminiscences.

The foregoing opinion of the effect of Pindar upon Goethe seems to be totally disproved by Goethe's letters of 1771-72 in which he expresses great admiration of Pindar. But the more one studies these letters, especially those addressed to Herder, the more one is impressed with their unnatural character. Partly they seem to have been written to please Herder, partly they seem to exhibit a slightly turbulent state of mind in their author at the time of their composition. It is not improbable that Goethe hastily glanced through Pindar for Herder's sake. How much Herder impelled Goethe to read can be inferred from the *Ephemerides* and from Goethe's letters; the result of this activity was, as Goethe writes in the above-mentioned letter to Herder: "Es geht bei mir noch alles entsetzlich durcheinander." To make a thorough study of Pindar would hardly have been possible for Goethe during the busy autumn and winter months of 1771-72; and Pindar is not a poet to captivate upon cursory reading.

PAUL REIFF.

Univ. of Wisconsin.

TWO SONNETS HITHERTO UNNOTICED.

The practical disappearance of the Sonnet in English literature from about 1658 to 1750 has been discussed by many authorities. It has been frequently stated that William Walsh wrote the

only sonnet during that period that has survived. In Ward's *English Poets*, III, 7, Mr. Gosse says, "Walsh is the author of the only sonnet written in English between Milton's, in 1658, and Warton's, about 1750." Mr. Gosse characteristically forgot a sonnet he had edited himself, the famous one by Gray, written in 1742. T. S. Perry, in his admirable and scholarly work, *English Literature in the Eighteenth Century*, makes the more guarded statement, that "Walsh is one of the few men who wrote sonnets in English between Milton and the Wartons" (p. 224, note). In the latest book published on English verse, Professor R. M. Alden's *English Verse*, 1903, an excellent manual and textbook, nothing is added to our information on this particular point. In the *Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement*, 1893, I first called attention to the prominent part played by Thomas Edwards in the revival of the sonnet, and in later impressions, I added a note (page 46) that I had discovered two sonnets of Edwards, dated 1746 and 1747 respectively.

I have recently had the good fortune to discover two sonnets that fall in this barren period, which add another author to the very scanty list. These sonnets, while devoid of intrinsic poetic merit, are in the regular Shaksperian form, and are by the notorious wit and courtly poet, Sir Charles Sedley. It is impossible to assign the exact year when they were composed, but as Sedley was about twenty-one years old in 1660, and died in 1701, they must have been written in what is loosely called the Restoration period. The two sonnets appear on pages 60 and 91 respectively of Sedley's *Poetical Works*, London, 1707. The first is entitled, *To Coscus*.

O Times! O Manners! *Cicero* cry'd out,
But 'twas when enrag'd *Catilin* conspir'd
To burn the City, and to cut the Throat
Of half the Senate, had his *Ruffians* hir'd:

When Son and Father did the World divide,
And *Rome* for Tyrants, not for Empire fought;
When slaughter'd Citizens on either side
Cover'd that Earth, her early Valour bought.

Of Times and Men, why dost thou now complain?
What is it, *Coscus*, that offends thee, say?
Our Laws the License of the Sword restrain;
And our Prince wills that his arm'd Troops obey:
His Reign, Success, Freedom and Plenty crown,
Blame not our Manners then, but mend thy own.